

REMARKS

- Claims 39-40 remain in this application. Claim 39 has been amended. By this amendment, no new matter has been added.

It may be helpful to summarize certain aspects of the invention, before responding to the specific rejections raised by the Examiner. The invention provides a novel method for manufacturing an interconnection element, which has proven useful for making resilient spring contact elements at very small sizes and pitches -- such as less than about 100 mils long, and closer than about 10 mils apart. Surprisingly, the claimed method of first shaping a relatively soft, low yield strength material with a harder, higher yield strength material to impart desired structural properties to the interconnection element has been tremendously successful in practice. This claimed method is quite different than any prior practice of coating the tip of a contact with a material having more favorable wear properties. Such prior practices never had the effect of altering the resilient structural property of the entire interconnection element in more than a *de minimus*, insignificant fashion, nor could they have suggested that any method be practiced for achieving this result.

The Examiner rejected Claims 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kister. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Kister merely discloses the well-known practice of applying a different material, such as rhodium or cobalt, to the tip of a contact for greater wear resistance. Kister fails to disclose or suggest "overcoating the elongate element with a second material which has a higher yield strength than the first material, in an amount sufficient for imparting a desired resiliency to the interconnection element, whereby the interconnection element after the overcoating step is substantially stiffer than the elongate element prior to the overcoating step," as defined by Claim 39. The other prior art references mentioned by the Examiner similarly fail to disclose or suggest the foregoing step. These rejections should therefore be withdrawn.

Serial No. 09/753,188
October 9, 2002
Page 4

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 39-40 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited.

To the extent it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned **"Version with markings to show changes made."**

While the Applicants believe that no fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in the fees, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 9, 2002



Brian M. Berliner
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 34,549

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899
Telephone: (213) 430-6000

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claim 39 has been amended, as follows:

39. (Amended) Method of mounting an interconnection element to a terminal of an electronic component, comprising:

attaching an elongate element of a first material to a terminal of an electronic component;

shaping the elongate element with a shaping tool; and

overcoating the elongate element with a second material which has a higher yield strength than the first material, in an amount sufficient for imparting a desired resiliency to the interconnection element, whereby the interconnection element after the overcoating step is substantially stiffer than the elongate element prior to the overcoating step.